Key:
Closed :
New:

C-9714
SR 108/US 101 Mason and Thurston Co Fish Barriers – Remove Fish Barriers Project

RFP Questions and Answers #1

Item Number	RFP	Question	Date	Response	Date
1	2.22.4.4.5 MOT	Please confirm that SR108 is not a pedestrian or bicycle route and will not require a “Pedestrian and Bicycle Access Plan” as described in Section 2.22.4.4.5.	12/16/2021	SR 108 is not a designated bicycle route but peds and bikes are present on SR 108 and will require a "Pedestrian and Bicycle Access Plan". Pedestrian and Bicycle routes shall be maintained at all times on SR 108 and the bypasses and shall follow the requirements of 2.9.5.6.5 Bicycle and Pedestrian Access and 2.22.4.4.5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Access During Construction.	**5/10/2022**
2	2.11.3.13	Section 2.11.3.13 lines 16 and 17 state that the existing culverts can be removed or abandoned, however lines 24-26 appear to state that all structures must be removed. Please verify that if an alternate stream alignment is used the existing structure can be abandoned.	12/16/2021	See Addendum #3.	**5/10/2022**
3		Please confirm that the two traffic operations alternatives for construction of the US 101 Griggs Creek crossings do not require accommodation for bicycle access.	1/10/2022	Pedestrian and Bicycle access shall be maintained with all maintenance of traffic operations on US 101 and the bypasses and shall follow the requirements of 2.9.5.6.5 Bicycle and Pedestrian Access and 2.22.4.4.5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Access During Construction.	**5/10/2022**
4	Appendix M01	In reference to BEAM GUARDRAIL TYPE 31 PLACEMENT 12’-6”, 18’-9”, OR 25’-0” SPAN STANDARD PLAN C-20.40-08, can the length of the CRT posts be increased to reduce the 2’ minimum extension of the 10:1 slope prior to the slope break point located behind the post.	1/13/2022	No, the proposed grading/post length changes do not match the crash test system conditions. The proposed modifications to the system cannot be considered MASH compliant unless crash tested.	**5/10/2022**
5	Appendix M01	In reference to BEAM GUARDRAIL TYPE 31 PLACEMENT 12’-6”, 18’-9”, OR 25’-0” SPAN STANDARD PLAN C-20.40-08, notes 4 and 5 require the grading requirements to extend 43.75’ upstream and downstream from CRT posts 3 and 4. Does the use of longer posts for BEAM GUARDRAIL TYPE 31 STANDARD PLAN C-20.10-07 supersede this requirement?	1/13/2022	No, the long span grading requirements supersede long post grading requirements due to MASH compliancy. So, standard 6-foot length posts can be used for the 43.75' upstream and downstream of the CRT posts, then the grading can be changed if desired for use with long posts.	**5/10/2022**
6	Appendix M01	In reference to BEAM GUARDRAIL TYPE 31 PLACEMENT 12’-6”, 18’-9”, OR 25’-0” SPAN STANDARD PLAN C-20.40-08, please clarify when fall protection is required on the top of wingwalls and headwalls in relation to their proximity to the face of the guardrail. Section 1060.03 of the design manual specifies, “Where a rail system is co-located with a vehicle barrier, locate the system outside the deflection distance for the barrier shown in Exhibit 1610-3.” Exhibit 1610-3 specifies a deflection distance of 5 ft for beam guardrail Type 31 (including two-sided and omitted post). Sections B1 and B2 indicate that no fall protection is needed for a 0” min. offset from back of guardrail posts, while if fall protection is provided, a minimum 8’ offset must be provided from the face of guardrail. If a wingwall starts outside the 5ft (or 8 ft) deflection distance that connects to a headwall located at the back of the guardrail posts, should the fall protection be terminated 5 ft from the face of guardrail?	1/13/2022	Fall protection is required on the edges of buried structures and associated headwalls and wingwalls per RFP 2.11.3.5, RFP 2.13.4.4, BDM 15.8.3.F, Std. Spec. 6-20.3(1)F and the WSDOT Design Manual for potential falls of 4 feet or more and should be placed outside of the guardrail deflection criteria shown in WSDOT Design Manual 1610-3.	**5/10/2022**

Item Number	RFP	Question	Date	Response	Date
7	Appendix M01	Can longer posts be utilized to reduce the widening behind the posts within the limits of the "BEAM GUARDRAIL TYPE 31 NON-FLARED TERMINAL – PAY LIMIT" if the widened areas in front of the post and at the end of the run are provided?	1/13/2022	No, terminals are proprietary products that are MASH crash tested. So, the terminals must be installed with the post lengths following the manufacturers recommendations/crash tested conditions for MASH compliancy. Also, terminal grading should follow the standard plan. If terminal grading does not follow the standard plan, then a Design Analysis may be needed.	**5/10/2022**
8	RFP	Is the CBE measured from the top or bottom of the chamfers, on precast box culverts that have a lower chamfer?	1/28/2022	The CBE is defined in the Section 2.30 definitions and the SFZ exhibits in H10. It is based on the Scour Check Flood Elevation or 2 feet below the Scour Check Flood elevation. The Section 2.30 definition does not allow for chamfers within the SFZ at the CBE.	**5/10/2022**
9	RFP, 2.30.6.7	Please confirm that once per month for every calendar month during fish passage warranty is in effect, the Design-Builder shall submit a report showing, for each fish passage on the project that is in fish passage Warranty during that month, for every hour in that month, the hourly streamflow in CFM and the hourly streamflow MRI in years.	2/14/2022	Yes, that requirement is stated in RFP section 2.30.6.7.	**5/10/2022**
10	2.3	Is WSDOT requiring the number of large wood pieces to install for habitat upstream and downstream of the crossing to reflect the total length of the reconstructed reach including the crossing, or just the total length outside the crossing? If the former, will WSDOT allow placement inside the structure?	2/28/2022	The design target for LWM key piece volume, total number of pieces, and volume should be based on the total length of the reconstructed reach including the crossing. Reference WSDOT Hydraulics Manual. Section 10-7.3 Habitat Design Process. WSDOT will not allow for placement within the structure without approval from the WSDOT State Hydraulic Engineer. If placement of LWM within the structure were to be approved, the WSDOT State Hydraulic Engineer would require the maintenance clearance to be increased to 10 ft and additional scour risk would need to be accounted for by the Design-Builder in the structure design. Reference RFP Section 2.30.5.6.1 Habitat Features and WSDOT Hydraulics Manual Section 7-4.5.2 Maintenance Clearance.	**5/10/2022**
11	Appendix M01	In the concept wingwall drawings that discuss the rationale behind the drawings, one of the criteria used to determine length is to go from 2 feet below scour (at what I assume is the edge of the structure) to the top of the roadway elevation at a 1:1. Is this a design criteria or requirement? If so, which document does it come from?	3/15/2022	The conceptual design was based of existing geotechnical data and stream SME evaluations. The 1:1 slope is the angle of repose slope as assumed by the design teams geotech. The buried structure length is not a design criteria or requirement. Final scour wall limits to be determined by the DB and shall meet the requirements WSDOT Scour Design Policy Design Memo issued 10/29/2021 and BDM 8.1.9.	**5/10/2022**
12	Appendix M01	It appears in the conceptual drawings WSDOT has increased length of wing walls to capture the amplitude of channel meandering as the limit of potential migration for three-sided buried structures. In channels with migration potential where the contractor is able to install countermeasures a short distance upstream outside of the ROW using natural materials to reduce migration potential, could the wing wall length be reduced?	5/4/2022	The Design-Builder may use Scour countermeasures in accordance with HEC 23 requirements to reduce the depth and length of wingwalls. The bottom of wingwall foundation or fascia for bridges and buried structures shall be a minimum of 2 feet below the scoured ground line that results when scour occurs up to the edge of the scour countermeasure as described in the WSDOT Scour Design Policy Design Memo issued 10/29/2021 and BDM 8.1.9. This scoured ground line extends at an angle of repose from the top of the scour countermeasure. The wingwalls benefit from use of a countermeasure by not being required to extend the foundation/fascia 2 feet below the scour line that occurs if no countermeasure is present (the condition shown in Figure 8.1.9-1 and -2 of the scour design memorandum). See figure on page 3 of this Q&A.	**5/10/2022**
13	Environmental	The RFP indicates the Design-Builder will be responsible for providing WSDOT supporting documentation for ESA consultation and NEPA reevaluations. Can WSDOT confirm if the DB will be responsible for Biological Assessments, as indicated in each wetland and stream assessment report?	5/6/2022	The DB shall follow the requirements of Section 2.8.5.6.1 as revised in addendum #6. WSDOT will revise and re-submit the PNF's based on revised project information received from the Design-Builder.	**5/10/2022**

Item Number	RFP	Question	Date	Response	Date
14	RFP Addendum 6	Section 2.1.1.4 of Chapter 2 states that "The NEPA documentation, environmental permits, and additional Right of Way for the project will be completed before issuance of NTP2." This appears to be in conflict with the addition of NTP 3 in Addendum 6. Please confirm that this is the case and the language in Section 2.1.1.4 should be revised.	5/6/2022	This will be addressed via Addendum #10. Section 2.1.1.4 will be revised as follows: The following will be deleted: The NEPA documentation, environmental permits, and additional Right of Way for the project will be completed before issuance of NTP2. And replaced with the following: The additional Right of Way for the project will be completed before issuance of NTP2. The NEPA documentation will be completed for each site prior to issuance of NTP3.	**5/10/2022**
15	WSDOT Scour Policy	Are countermeasures required to be placed in front of retaining walls adjacent to bridge ends for the entire length of retaining wall? WSDOT BDM 8.1.9 indicates that scour countermeasures may be placed at bridge ends but does not identify if the countermeasures are required to be carried for the length of retaining wall. HEC-23 and the WSDOT Scour Design Policy memorandum are also somewhat silent on the extent to which countermeasures are required to be placed parallel to the roadway and whether or not they are required to be placed in front of the retaining walls.	5/6/2022	Where scour countermeasures are used, they will need to extend along abutment wingwalls and retaining walls to the point determined by the Design-Builder's Hydraulic Engineer where scour and stream migration could extend. If countermeasures are stopped prior to this, they could be undermined from the ends working back towards the abutments.	**5/10/2022**